

Serial No. 10/633,642
December 9, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated September 9, 2005
Page 4 of 6

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-6 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Furukawa et al. (U.S. 6,588,094). Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Furukawa et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claim 1-6.

Claim 1 recites:

"A method of manufacturing a chip-type ceramic electronic component comprising the steps of:
preparing ceramic green sheets having predetermined cutting positions;
coating an inorganic material on a region of each of the ceramic green sheets, inclusive of the predetermined cutting positions;
laminating a predetermined number of the ceramic green sheets to form a ceramic laminated product;
cutting the ceramic laminated product into a chip at the predetermined cutting positions, and sintering the chip to form a ceramic sintered compact; and
forming external electrodes at both ends of the ceramic sintered compact;
wherein **the inorganic material includes the same ceramic material as that included in the ceramic green sheets,** and an inorganic material having higher resistivity than that of the ceramic material." (emphasis added)

With the unique combination of method steps and features recited in Applicants' claim 1, including the features of "coating an inorganic material on a region of each of the ceramic green sheets, inclusive of the predetermined cutting positions" and "the inorganic material includes the same ceramic material as that included in the ceramic green sheets," Applicants have been able to provide a method of manufacturing a chip-type ceramic electronic component that prevents cavitation of a diffusion layer of a high-resistivity inorganic material which is formed on the surface of a ceramic sintered compact, thereby preventing corrosion of the ceramic sintered compact (see, for example, the third full paragraph on page 2 of the Substitute Specification).

Serial No. 10/633,642
December 9, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated September 9, 2005
Page 5 of 6

The Examiner alleged that Furukawa et al. teaches all of the features recited in Applicants' claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In contrast to Applicants' claim 1, Furukawa et al. teaches that "a glass paste 16," which the Examiner alleged corresponds to the inorganic material recited in Applicants' claim 1, is coated on each of the inner-layer green sheets 18 and on an inner face of the outer-layer green sheets 17. Col. 4, lines 3-13 of Furukawa et al. further teaches that the diffused layers 13 and 13a (which is formed by the diffusion of the glass paste 16 on the inner face of the outer-layer green sheets 17) need not necessarily comprise glass material. Instead, of a glass material, a material having a higher specific resistance than the thermistor element and containing one or more oxides containing a trivalent metal such as Al, Si, Ti and Sn or a metal of higher valency and metals such as Zn, Al, W, Zr, Sb, Y, Sm, Ti and Fe may be applied.

However, Furukawa et al. fails to teach or suggest that the inorganic material (glass or metal paste 16) includes the same ceramic material as that included in any of the ceramic green sheets. In fact, Furukawa et al. fails to teach or suggest any relationship whatsoever between the ceramic material of the ceramic green sheets and the inorganic material, and certainly fails to teach or suggest that the inorganic material could or should include the same ceramic material as that included in the ceramic green sheets. Thus, Furukawa et al. clearly fails to teach or suggest the features of "coating an inorganic material on a region of each of the ceramic green sheets, inclusive of the predetermined cutting positions" and "the inorganic material includes the same ceramic material as that included in the ceramic green sheets" as recited in Applicants' claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that, contrary to the Examiner's allegations, Furukawa et al. fails to teach or suggest each and every feature and method step recited in Applicants' claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Furukawa et al.

Serial No. 10/633,642
December 9, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated September 9, 2005
Page 6 of 6

Applicants have not provided the optional "reference numerals (either in parentheses next to the claimed limitation or in a table format with one column listing the claimed limitation and another column listing corresponding reference numerals in the remarks section of the response to an Office Action) to all the claimed limitations as well as support in the disclosure for better clarity," as requested by the Examiner in paragraph no. 5 of the outstanding Office Action, because claims 1-6 of the present application do not require any further clarification.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2-6 depend upon claim 1, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 9, 2005


Attorneys for Applicant

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett
Registration No. 46,710

KEATING & BENNETT, LLP
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 850
Tyson's Corner, VA 22102
Telephone: (703) 637-1480
Facsimile: (703) 637-1499